

-7-

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prager in view of Peterson. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant's claims recite a method in which requesting and delivering software applications do not know *a priori* the exact definition of information to be exchanged. Requesting and delivering software applications negotiate an information exchange format.

On the other hand, Prager teaches a method of accessing information in which the requester (i.e., activity 24) need only request. Delivery software (i.e., link 28 and conversion object 20) deliver converted information to activity 24. In more detail, link 28 creates a stream object 20 containing the information, a reference to the character set, and a pointer to the location of the information. Conversion object 22 converts the information using the character set and delivers the converted information to activity 24.

Thus, with respect to claim 1, Prager fails to disclose

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

-8-


publishing a list of one or more data fields used by
one or more software applications;
mapping the published data fields;
flagging mapped data fields by at least one of the
one or more software applications;

While Peterson may disclose a tree structure associated
with a document in translation, Peterson does not teach or
suggest use of the tree structure as a basis for comparing
data fields common to two software applications.

Applicant has added new claim 13.

Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims
be allowed.

Respectfully Submitted,



Paul W. Martin
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,870
(937) 445-2990

JAN 25 2005

BEST AVAILABLE COPY